

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the examiner's review of the present application and requests reconsideration in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

The examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Without admission, applicant is canceling claim 21.

The examiner rejects claims 1-21 under 35 USC section 102(b) as being anticipated by McAlindon. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The reference cited by the examiner does not disclose the "switch lever range extender" as recited in claim 1. The examiner of points to elements 79, 80 and 81 in the cited reference for this element. However, a more detailed review of the cited reference at column 8, lines 8 through 11 clearly show that elements 79, 80 and 81 have to do with adding tension to the switch of the cited reference. These elements have nothing to do with adjusting or extending the "range" of the switch lever as recited in claim one of the present application. Accordingly, for

In re: Dr. Kevin Murphy
Filed: February 19, 2004
Serial No.: 10/782,049
Page 9

this reason alone, the reference is not anticipating. Further, the reference does not make obvious the present invention recited in claim 1.

Regarding claim 19, this claim has been amended to include a frame that has "an extent and sized to be disposed proximate at least three regions of said physically challenged user and to which may be selectively mounted at least one user operable switch lever" which again is an element not found in the cited reference.

In contrast, the "frame" element which the examiner points to in the cited reference is in effect part and parcel of the switch and cannot be disposed proximate at least three regions of the user (for example, proximate the front, left side and right side of the user) and to which may be selectively mounted at least one user operable switch lever.

Accordingly, applicant urges that the cited reference does not anticipate claim 19 since each and every feature of claim 19 is not disclosed or made obvious by the cited reference.

Applicant thus believes that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowability is requested.

In the event a Petition for Extension of Time is required by

In re: Dr. Kevin Murphy
Filed: February 19, 2004
Serial No.: 10/782,049
Page 10

this paper and not otherwise provided, such Petition is hereby made and authorization is provided herewith to charge Deposit Account No. 02-3285 for the cost of such extension.

The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Kevin Murphy

By



Paul Kroon, Jr., Esquire
Registration No. 51902
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

Telephone: (603) 623-5111
Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date: June 10, 2005